

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,174	06/29/2001	Kevin Paul Downes	159.1.847	9551
75	90 04/24/2002			
WATOV & KIPNES, P.C.			EXAMINER	
P.O. Box 247			HENDERSON, MARK T	
Princeton Junction, NJ 08550				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3722	
			DATE MAILED: 04/24/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Application No.

09/896,174

Applicant(s)

Downes et al

# Office Action Summary

Examiner

Mark Henderson

Art Unit **3722** 



The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
communication Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b	CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed cation.		
Status  1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This ac	tion is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pa	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is arte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims			
4) 💢 Claim(s) <u>1-8</u>	is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideratio		
. 5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.		
6) 💢 Claim(s) <u>1-8</u>	is/are rejected.		
7)	is/are objected to.		
8)	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <i>Jun 29, 2001</i> is/a	re objected to by the Examiner.		
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: வி approved வி disapproved.		
12) $\square$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 12.	niner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).		
a) □ All b) □ Some* c) □ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have			
_	ve been received in Application No		
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority of application from the International Bure *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the action for a			
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).		
Attachment(s)			
15) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).		
16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	20) Other:		

Art Unit: 3722

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Faxing of Responses to Office Actions**

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, TC 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703)872-9302 (Official) and (703)872-9303 (for After Finals). This practice may be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into TC 3700 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

## **Drawings**

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "6" has been used to designate both a "first play area" and a "first game area". Correction is required.

Art Unit: 3722

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "8" has been used to designate both a "second play area" and a "second game area". Correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. Claim 1 recites the limitations: "the player" in line 9; and "the prize area" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 5. Claim 5 recites the limitation "the face" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 3722

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claims 1-3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walker et al (6,250,685).

Walker et al discloses a lottery ticket comprising a first game area (120) containing a plurality of play indicia (120E-120G) on a plurality of rows (3 rows as seen in Fig. 2), wherein at least two indicia are combined to obtain a target indicia (seen in Fig. 2); a second game area (130) adjacent each row of the first game area and designating a target indicia (130E-130G) which are obtained by combining at least two indicia from the first game area (seen in Fig. 2); and a prize area (140) comprising prize designations (140E-140G).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3722

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4, 5 and 8, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al.

Walker et al discloses a lottery ticket comprising all the elements as claimed in Claim 1, and as set forth above. However, Walker et al does not disclose indicia appearing on a face of a playing card or on the face of dice; a third play area designating a prize, additional numbers, additional target indicia or a multiplying feature.

In regards to Claims 4, 5 and 8, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the play indicia on any type of face figure (dice or playing card, etc.) since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Applicant has failed to disclose in the claims that the indicia appearing on a face of another indicium figure is critical to the invention and that it solves any stated problem, and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any type of face figure or not. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack* 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). Also, in the present case, there appears to be no new or unobvious structural relationship between the printed matter and the substrate.

Application/Control Number: 09/816,174

Art Unit: 3722

: 3722

In regards to Claim 8, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

Page 6

the time the invention was made to include as many play areas as desired, since it has been held

that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the

art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

Prior Art References

The prior art references listed in the attached PTO-892, but not used in a rejection of the

claims, are cited for (their/its) structure. Katz, Behm et al, Deshiens et al, Feola, Guttin et al, and

Sultan disclose lottery tickets.

Application/Control Number: 09/816,174

Art Unit: 3722

### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark T. Henderson whose telephone number is (703)305-0189. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM to 3:45 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, A. L. Wellington, can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax number for TC 3700 is (703)-872-9302. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148.

MTH

April 19, 2002

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Page 7